

Exhibit 1



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

August 11, 2017

Karen Dunn
Hamish Hume
Boies Schiller Flexner LLP
1401 New York Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20005

Re: Waymo LLC v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., Case No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

Dear Ms. Dunn and Mr. Hume:

As you know, we represent Anthony Levandowski in connection with the above-titled litigation. We have reviewed the parties' recent filings in Docket 1060 and 1082, along with the transcript of the hearing that occurred before Judge Corley on August 9, 2017. It appears that Uber and Ottomotto (collectively "Uber") have taken the position that communications that occurred during a March 29, 2017 meeting between Mr. Levandowski, Travis Kalanick, and Uber's in-house litigation counsel, Angela Padilla, were *not* privileged. We object to Uber's position.

To be clear, Mr. Levandowski does not waive his privileges with respect to *any* of the meetings that occurred on March 29, 2017. This includes the initial meeting at which only Mr. Levandowski, Mr. Kalanick, and Ms. Padilla were present. Mr. Levandowski's position is that the communications at that initial meeting are protected from disclosure by the attorney-client and common interest privileges.

We understand from Judge Corley's statements at the August 9 hearing that the court will not address the full scope of Uber's waiver without soliciting input from our firm, as Mr. Levandowski's counsel. Dkt. 1142 (8/9/2017 Tx.) at 23, 35, 37. We write to provide you with notice that we intend to raise our objections to the court in the forthcoming briefing.

We look forward to further elaborating our position, and the legal bases therefore, in accordance with the briefing schedule to be worked out by the parties and Special Master Cooper. *Id.* at 44.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ismail J. Ramsey

Ismail Ramsey
RAMSEY & EHRlich LLP
Counsel for Non-Party Anthony Levandowski